

SHUMAKER & SIEFFERT, P.A. RECEIVED  
1625 RADIO DRIVE, SUITE 300 CENTRAL FAX CENTER  
WOODBURY, MINNESOTA 55125 MAY - 7 2007  
TEL 651.735-1100  
FAX 651.735-1102  
WWW.SSIPLAW.COM

---

FACSIMILE SUBMISSION UNDER 37 CFR 1.8

---

TO:	FROM:
Mail Stop: Amendments	Daniel T. Lund
COMPANY:	DATE:
USPTO	MAY 7, 2007
FAX NUMBER:	TOTAL NO. OF PAGES INCLUDING COVER:
1-571-273-8300	3
PHONE NUMBER:	SENDER'S REFERENCE NUMBER:
	1081-020US02/STL10773.1
RE:	APPLICATION SERIAL NUMBER:
Response to Restriction Requirement	10/617,627

---

This facsimile message is intended for the sole use of the intended recipient(s) and may contain information that is confidential, privileged and/or attorneys' work product. Any review or distribution by any other person is prohibited. If you are not an intended recipient, please immediately contact the sender and delete all copies.

---

MAY - 7 2007

PATENTIN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Clifton J. Williamson; Peter I. Vasiliev	Confirmation No.	4261
Serial No.:	10/617,627		
Filed:	July 10, 2003	Customer No.:	28863
Examiner:	Guy J. Lamarre		
Group Art Unit:	2112		
Docket No.:	1081-020US02/STL10773.1		
Title:	<u>METHOD AND APPARATUS FOR ERROR DETECTION</u>		

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8 I hereby certify that this correspondence is being transmitted via facsimile to the United States Patent and Trademark Office on May 7, 2007.

By:   
Name: Patricia Cygan

RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Commissioner for Patents  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

This response is to the Office Action mailed April 5, 2007. Claims 1-14 and 17-22 have been restricted under 35 U.S.C. § 121 as follows:

- I. Species I, Independent claims 1, 7 and intervening claims;
- II. Species II, Independent claim 19 and intervening claims.

Applicants hereby elect Species II with traverse.

General Traversal

Applicants hereby elect Species II with traverse as the Office Action mailed April 5, 2007 fails to meet the criteria of a proper restriction requirement under the MPEP. According to MPEP § 803, there are two criteria for a proper requirement for restriction between patentably distinct inventions: (A) The inventions must be independent (see MPEP § 802.01, § 806.04, §